

### **REMARKS**

The Examiner's Action mailed February 5, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the present Reply, claims 1 and 3 are pending in the application. Claim 2 is cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Without regard to patentability, claims 1 and 3 are amended to more distinctly claim the present invention. Support for the amended claims can be found at, for example, presently canceled claim 2.

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's consideration of, and making of record, the documents submitted by the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 19, 2006.

### **Title Objection**

The Title stands objected to as allegedly not descriptive. See MPEP 606.01. A new Title is supplied by amendment herein. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Japan Patent Publication No. 09-082759 to Saito Koichi (hereinafter the "Saito

reference"). Claims 1-3 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Japan Patent Publication No. 49-33564 to Suzuki (hereinafter the "Suzuki reference"). Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0151141 to Matsuki, et al. (hereinafter the "Matsuki reference"). Applicant respectfully traverses each of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Saito, Suzuki and Matsuki references do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, every element set forth in presently amended claims 1 and 3. For example, the Saito, Suzuki and Matsuki references do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, that a volume of an inside of the opening is greater than a sum of a volume of the connection electrode and a volume of the low-melting-point metallic part as now recited by claims 1 and 3. For instance, the Saito reference teaches a wiring board comprising a protrusion electrode (27) and a solder layer (28) formed on the protrusion electrode (27) (see, e.g., Fig. 2 of Saito). The protrusion electrode (27) and the solder layer (28) are provided in an opening (42) formed in a spacer (41). The sum of the height of the protrusion electrode (27) and the height of the solder layer (28) is greater than the thickness of the spacer (41). As described in the Saito reference, the total height of the protrusion electrode (27) and solder layer (28) is 0.25 mm (see paragraph [0007]) and the thickness of the spacer (41) is 0.2 mm (see paragraph [0010]).

The Saito reference fails to teach or suggest the volumes of the protrusion electrode (27), the solder layer (28) or the opening (42). Furthermore, the relationship between the volume of the opening (42) and the sum of the

volume of the protrusion electrode (27) and the volume of the solder layer (28) cannot be determined from any particular sectional view illustrated by the figures (see, e.g., Fig. 2 of Saito). The Suzuki reference similarly fails to teach or suggest the volumes of a connection electrode (6), a low-melting-point metallic part or an opening. Furthermore, the relationship between the volume of the opening and the sum of the volume of the connection electrode (6) and the volume of the low-melting-point metallic part cannot be determined from any particular sectional view illustrated by the figures. The Matsuki reference likewise fails to teach or suggest the volumes of a projection-like electrode (35), a solder layer (42) and any opening. Furthermore, the relationship between the volume of any opening and the sum of the volume of the projection-like electrode (35) and the volume of the solder layer (42) cannot be determined from any particular section view illustrated by the figures (see, e.g., Figs. 31A and 31B). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending rejected claims.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, at the telephone number listed below.

Should any fee be required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert H. Berdo, Jr. – Reg. No. 38,075  
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995  
Facsimile: 202-408-0924  
Telephone: 202-371-8976

May 5, 2008

Date

RHB/TJM/ng